

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee**  
**March 21, 2002**  
**9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**  
**NWIFC Conference Center**  
**Minutes**

---

**Attendees:**

Clark, Jeffrey	Weyerhaeuser
Cramer, Darin	DNR
Dominquez, Larry	DNR
Edson , Scott	Colville Tribes
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Hansen, Craig	USFWS
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW
Liquori, Mike	Campbell Group
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	CMER Co-chair
McNaughton, Geoff	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	UCUT
Poon, Derek	EPA
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Quinn, Timothy	WDFW, CMER Co-chair
Robinson, Tom	WSAOC
Rowe, Blake	Longview Fibre
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-hames, Dave	NWIFC

---

**Minutes:** February minutes were approved as amended.

---

**Budget Update:** McNaughton is polishing the spreadsheet into a presentation format so that it is easier for people to understand. There are \$1.7 million in unallocated monies based on projections to date. CMER may have slightly more money than the budget reflects due to some first year billing errors that are favorable to the CMER budget. These errors are minor and would apparently be difficult and costly for the DNR to correct retroactively; McNaughton is researching these errors now. The third year federal monies have arrived, but to obtain release of these funds, DNR must sign a contract with IAC. Forests & Fish, in its entirety, receives about \$4 million per year. CMER presently receives about \$2.5 million of these funds. The other monies are pass through dollars designated for other agencies to implement Forests & Fish.

---

**SAG Requests:** Doug Martin distributed a proposal form that SAGs can use to make requests to CMER. We generally spend considerable time on SAG items, and developing an outline and format for requests will shorten the length of these discussions. Martin recommends that these forms be submitted to McNaughton at least one week prior to the CMER meeting. McNaughton will then organize the requests and forward them to CMER. This form will alleviate the need for so much discussion and will speed up the approval process.

## CMER 3/21/02 Minutes Continued

It was also suggested that we separate the SAG requests from SAG issues. In the future, these two items will be separated on the agenda. In addition, new issues requiring CMER decisions should only come before CMER after sufficient background information has been provided to members.

**CMER Recommendation:** CMER recommends that these forms be forwarded to SAGs and the larger CMER community with instructions for use included.

---

### SAG Requests:

RSAG: no requests.

UPSAG: Liquori updated the group there are three headwater literature reviews already completed and numerous conferences have been held to discuss headwaters. Therefore, UPSAG is unsure that there is a need for any additional literature reviews on the topic. Thus, they may not go forward with their review. There is a subgroup working within UPSAG to address this issue.

ISAG: no requests.

BTSAG: no requests.

WETSAG: no requests.

LWAG: no requests.

SAGE: no requests.

---

**SRC Update:** McNaughton recently submitted the RSAG study design for monitoring the effectiveness of the FFR riparian prescriptions. He indicated that everything appears to be on schedule. There have been discussions surrounding whether these reviews should be blind or open for discussion. For a study design, open discussion and interaction is preferred, so we may not want to insist on all reviews being double blind. Reviews are still scheduled to take eight weeks, no longer. There may be a need to fast track some reviews and McNaughton indicated that this may be possible in special cases.

Also, the university continues to add to their reviewer database, and has been posting more and more information to the Internet for easy CMER access. The managing editor is finalizing associate editors with technical expertise in various topics to ensure that people with the proper qualifications manage the reviews.

Quinn reminded CMER that any communication to the SRC must go through McNaughton, as CMER can be billed for these interactions. Liquori said that in the case of study designs, sending feedback through several loops can dilute the content. It may be helpful if the associate editors communicate directly with the SAGs. Quinn agreed that it is hard for reviewers to comment without communication from CMER; conference calls may be an option.

A related issue surrounding the SRC is that we need to carefully craft our questions so that the content of the reviews meets our needs. In addition, the costs can be greatly increased if we ask the wrong questions. Quinn said, for example, there is a difference between asking the reviewers to comment on a study design and asking them if there are better designs to answer the questions.

McNaughton said that Richard Bigley, DNR is in charge of the adaptive management program for the DNR trust lands HCP. He is also interested in receiving peer review. He is hoping to use the SRC for this review and will pay them from the HCP budget. McNaughton requested input from CMER about this. The group was generally supportive of Bigley receiving peer review from the SRC as long as it did not detract from CMER needs. (Note: a small group discussion later during the break thought there might be a perceived

## CMER 3/21/02 Minutes Continued

conflict of interest with DNR trust lands using UW/WSU for peer review since state universities benefit financially from management of these lands.)

Lastly, Martin reiterated that once your review is approved by CMER to go to the SRC, you should work with McNaughton. The project does not need to come back to CMER for re-approval; even it takes several months after the approval date to actually get to the SRC.

---

**Data Release Policy:** McNaughton has been researching this issue but does not have a definitive answer yet. Thus far, he has found that DNR must treat all requests equally, and uses the public disclosure process for all data releases. Official DNR corporate databases such as the Hydro or Trans GIS layers are for sale only. This means that even CMER cooperators who allow data to be collected on their lands must pay for corporate data, and for photocopying of other types of data. This issue has been discussed at the FFR policy level and within the DNR Financial Management Division.

Robinson said that DNR has two types of data: proprietary and public information. He believes there may be copy costs associated with proprietary data, but you should not be required to go through public disclosure. Rowe added that if CMER is asking landowners for access to sites for data collection, the landowner should receive a copy of the data. This issue should be resolved before landowners are approached for access. Pavel added that one of the FFR commitments was to create a database that will provide centralized information management and we should discuss who will have access to that information. Requests from landowners and contractors to publish data also must be resolved.

---

**Conflict of Interest:** McNaughton said that we must be fair to potential contractors that that can only rely on the official RFP, and only when it is formally distributed with a tight deadline to respond. One of the most common grounds for protesting a DNR contract award alleges that one contractor may have had the RFP longer than other potential contractors. When we are discussing specifics of contracts, we need to be cognizant of who is in the room. At this time, we are asking those who are interested in bidding to leave the room when specifics are discussed.

This DNR policy does not fit well with the open CMER process, but they are working on it. One potential fix to this issue is to post all draft contracting materials on the CMER website for all potential contractors to see. Also, bear in mind that these are open public meetings and anyone can attend. With this being the case, there should be no issue with conflicts of interest because no one is excluded. McNaughton pointed out that we cannot drop this issue because it is illegal for contractors to have an unfair advantage; we must continue to research this. Fransen added that we may not want potential contractors influencing the drafting of proposals either. The CMER distribution list (e-mail) is open to anyone and represents another avenue for potential contractors to stay advised about current opportunities. However, we may need to publish a newspaper ad that announces the availability of the CMER distribution list to potential contractors.

McNaughton will continue to work on both the data release policy and the conflict of interest issue. He will update CMER when necessary.

---

**FFR Retreat:** The first in a series of FFR retreats is scheduled for April 25<sup>th</sup>. The broad agenda for this first session is to focus on the consensus-based process, provide a history of the TFW process for newer participants in FFR, and discuss, during a brainstorming session in the afternoon, topics for upcoming one-day sessions over the summer. The goal is to, at the end of the summer, have a clear vision for CMER and have a close to complete CMER work plan.

**CMER Recommendation:** CMER approved an additional \$3,000.00 for facilitation.

Rowton will contact Thompson Dicks and see if they are willing to provide the facilitation.

---

## CMER 3/21/02 Minutes Continued

**Policy Presentations:** McNaughton said that CMER has received a formal request from policy to provide presentations to them regarding PIPs and SIPS survey status and the watertyping model. This is rather short notice and there are detailed questions that need to be answered. Policy would like to hear descriptions of the problems that are being encountered and questions that need to be answered to allow these two projects to move forward. McNaughton then opened it up for discussion.

Martin suggested talking about the watertyping request first. Cramer said that ISAG already has the semblance of a plan and is working out the details. It is likely that Fransen and Cramer will give the main presentation and will focus on the following: the modeling process and where it stands, the validation procedures, and when it would be best to implement the model. They will then discuss options for field validation, when it should be done, what it entails, etc. There is a decision point coming up on when to implement the model and the purpose of this presentation is to ensure that policy members understand the issues and are informed before a decision is made.

There was much discussion about how best to present this information to the Policy Committee and the details of a presentation. Concern was noted that CMER presentations to Policy should be done by CMER not SAGs. ISAG was questioned about whether there is consensus within ISAG on issues related to the watertyping model; ISAGers indicated that they do have consensus on technical issues, and on which issues are appropriately Policy decisions.

PIP and SIP surveys: Liquori said that UPSAG is meeting next week and will outline the issues they will present to policy.

---

**Focus on Adaptive Management:** Martin said that some projects have clearly defined steps but others do not. We need to consider what the potential consequences of the various studies are. CMER should address all of the questions that need to be answered to ensure confidence in adaptive management decisions. The second problem is that studies spawned in one SAG may be related to projects conceived under another SAG. For example, NF and PIP are related and should be considered together. Martin suggests that we focus on this over time; continually revisiting these issues will help us get at the AM issues.

There was much discussion about this topic. The stakeholder group has been suggested to help with this issue. We need to regularly check in with each other. Since adaptive management is the goal, we need to keep that in mind as we design things and look at them. CMER's job is to provide oversight for the SAGs. CMER could explore the relationships and identify where SAG cooperation is necessary to get to adaptive management. Quinn suggested that we spend one day per month on process (as needed) and one day on science. If a subgroup focused on the process, the larger CMER body could focus on the science. Dominquez said that this is a good issue to deal with during the FFR retreats (mentioned above).

---

**May Science Topic:** NF effectiveness, headwater literature review, and PIPs. Discussion of how they are related.

Other science topics to discuss in the future include water typing, the bull trout overlay and DFC.

---

### SAG Updates:

**BTSAG:** Jackson said that BTSAG is getting close to a final deadline for the bull trout overlay survey work, which has already been delayed one year. If BTSAG cannot deliver an RFP to DNR by the end of next week, this will need to be postponed another year. The issue is that the cost estimate for this project has gone up substantially. Jackson requested input from CMER as to whether BTSAG should go ahead with the study and decide, among themselves, how to appropriate the monies or if BTSAG should bring the issue to CMER for a decision.

---

### **CMER 3/21/02 Minutes Continued**

CMER recommends that BTSAG make a decision and move forward with the project. When a decision has been made, send a letter to policy stating what the decision was.

---

**Announcements:** Hansen announced that the USFWS is looking for someone to work with them on HCP development. If you know of someone who may be interested, please let him know.

---

**Next Meeting:** April 18<sup>th</sup>.